

## Message Text

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00014 281758Z

43

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ACDE-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 USIE-00 INRE-00

AEC-05 CIAE-00 H-01 INR-07 IO-10 L-02 NSAE-00 OIC-02

OMB-01 PA-01 PM-03 PRS-01 SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15

TRSE-00 RSC-01 NSC-05 BIB-01 ISO-00 /082 W

----- 066920

O R 281710Z JAN 75

FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 808

SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE

INFO USMISSION

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T MBFR VIENNA 0014

FROM US REP MBFR

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO

SUBJECT: MBFR: NAC DISCUSSION OF EASTERN FREEZE PROPOSAL

REF: US NATO 0432

1. WE ARE PLEASED THAT US NATO'S PRESENTATION OF WASHINGTON GUIDANCE HAS FURTHERED THE US POSITION ON EASTERN FREEZE PROPOSAL. WE BELIEVE THE CENTRAL ISSUES TO BE KEPT IN MIND IN THIS END PHASE OF ALLIED CONSULTATION ARE AS FOLLOWS:

A.A PRINCIPAL SOVIET MOTIVATION IN THE MBFR NEGOTIATIONS IS TO ESTABLISH LIMITS ON THE SIZE OF NATO FORCES.

B. THE ALLIES HAVE BEEN WILLING TO ACCEPT CERTAIN CAREFULLY ARTICULATED LIMITS, BUT ONLY IN RETURN FOR EASTERN MOVEMENT TOWARDS ALLIED

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00014 281758Z

NEGOTIATING OBJECTIVES, PARTICULARLY THE COMMON

CEILING CONCEPT.

C. FOR THE ALLIES TO ACCEPT SUCH LIMITATIONS IN THE CONTEXT OF A FREEZE SEPARATE FROM REDUCTIONS WOULD DEPRIVE THEM OF THIS VALUABLE LEVERAGE FOR USE TOWARD THEIR REDUCTION OBJECTIVES.

D. TO JUDGE FROM THE SOVIET DRAFT AGREEMENT, BREZHNEV'S PERSONAL STATEMENTS, AND STATEMENTS OF SOVIET NEGOTIATORS IN VIENNA, THE SOVIETS DESIRE TO REGISTER SOME PROGRESS IN MBFR DURING 1975.

E. IF THE SOVIETS REACH AGREEMENT ON A FREEZE, WHATEVER INTEREST THEY MAY HAVE IN ACHIEVING A POSITIVE RESULT IN THE VIENNA NEGOTIATIONS DURING THIS CALENDAR YEAR MAY BE SATISFIED.

F. TO SUMMARIZE, THE ALLIES WANT THE SOVIETS TO PAY FOR A FREEZE WITH FAVORABLE REDUCTION TERMS. THE SOVIETS IN TURN WANT A FREEZE AT MINIMUM COST TO THEMSELVES. A SEPARATE FREEZE AGREEMENT WOULD MEET BOTH SOVIET REQUIREMENTS DESCRIBED, BUT NO ALLIED ONES.

2. IN CONSEQUENCE, IT IS QUITE POSSIBLE THAT, WHATEVER CONDITIONS THE WEST MAY ATTACH TO A FREEZE IN ITS RESPONSE TO THE EASTERN PROPOSAL, THE SOVIETS MAY BE WILLING TO NEGOTIATE ON THEM IN ORDER TO TRY TO MOVE THE ALLIES TOWARDS THE CONCEPT OF A FREEZE AS AN INDEPENDENT ACTION, SEPARATE FROM A REDUCTION AGREEMENT.

3. TO BE IN A POSITION TO COUNTER THIS POSSIBLE EASTERN TACTIC, THE ALLIES SHOULD NOT ONLY ASSOCIATE THE FREEZE WITH REDUCTIONS BUT ALSO SHOULD STAND FIRM ON GIVING PRIORITY TO NEGOTIATION ON REDUCTIONS. ACCORDINGLY, IT IS IMPORTANT THAT THE TEXT OF THE GUIDANCE SHOULD RETAIN THE SENTENCE TO THIS EFFECT AND THAT POSSIBLE ALLIED EFFORTS AT DELETION OF THIS SENTENCE SHOULD BE RESISTED. FYI. THE PRESENT WORDING WOULD ALSO PROVIDE THE US SOME HOLD WITH THE ALLIES IF THE SOVIETS SHOW FLEXIBILITY IN THE COURSE OF POSSIBLE ATTEMPTS TO SPLIT OFF A FREEZE FROM REDUCTIONS. END FYI.

4. IN THE LIGHT OF THIS ANALYSIS, WE HAVE THE FOLLOWING  
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00014 281758Z

COMMENTS ON ISSUES RAISED IN REFTEL:

A. WITH REGARD TO GERMAN DIFFICULTIES ON FORM OF AGREEMENT IN PARA 4A OF REFTEL, FROM A NEGOTIATING VIEWPOINT, WE SEE NO DIFFICULTY WITH USING THE PHRASE "SHOULD BE NEGOTIATED IN DIRECT REPEAT DIRECT CONNECTION WITH AN AGREEMENT TO REDUCE."

B. AS REGARDS PARA 4B, IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE ANALYSIS ABOVE, AND IN ORDER BETTER TO RESIST

POSSIBLE SOVIET EFFORTS TO SEPARATE DISCUSSION OF A FREEZE FROM DISCUSSION OF REDUCTIONS, WE WOULD WISH TO RETAIN THE PRESENT WORDING AND AVOID IN DISCUSSION WITH THE EAST THE CONCEPT OF A WESTERN PROPOSAL OR COUNTER-PROPOSAL. USE BY THE ALLIES OF THE WORD "PROPOSAL" IN REPLYING TO THE EAST IS NOT A NECESSARY PRE-CONDITION FOR INFORMING WESTERN OPINION THAT THE ALLIES HAD MADE A COUNTER-PROPOSAL ON THE FREEZE.

C. PARA 4C OF REFTEL: AS WE INTERPRET THE US PROPOSAL, THE WEST WOULD NEGOTIATE WITH THE EAST ON THE TERMS OF A FREEZE COVERING THE PERIOD BETWEEN SIGNATURE OF A FIRST REDUCTION AGREEMENT AND THE ENTRY INTO EFFECT OF SUCH AN AGREEMENT ONLY AFTER AGREEMENT HAD BEEN REACHED ON THE PHASE I US-SOVIET REDUCTIONS AND THE ACCOMPANYING NO-INCREASE PROVISIONS FOR THE REMAINING DIRECT PARTICIPANTS. AGREEMENT ON REDUCTIONS IN TURN WOULD HAVE TO REST ON SOME EAST-WEST UNDERSTANDING REGARDING DATA. IF THIS SEQUENCE IS FOLLOWED, AN UNDERSTANDING REGARDING DATA WOULD THEREFORE PRECEDE DISCUSSION OF THE FREEZE. IT SHOULD BE KEPT IN MIND THAT, IN THE LAST DISCUSSION WITH THE EAST OF THE FREEZE PROPOSAL IN INFORMAL SESSION PRIOR TO THE BREAK, ALLIED REPS ASKED THE EAST FOR A CONSIDERED RESPONSE TO POINTS ALLIED REPS HAD MADE ON DATA AND NATIONAL SUB-CEILINGS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE DEC 7 NATO CM(74)90 GUIDANCE. ALTHOUGHT THE SOVIETS MIGHT IN TIME TAKE A MORE ACCOMMODATING POSITION IN THE COURSE OF ACTIVE DISCUSSION OF A FREEZE, THEIR RESPONSE AT THIS TIME AS REGARDS DATA MAY BE A NEGATIVE ONE. IF THIS IS THE CASE, ALLIED REPRESENTATIVES SHOULD DRAW ON THIS EXISTING GUIDANCE AND MAKE THE ADDITIONAL POINT ON THE ABSENCE OF DATA AFTER PRESENTING THE POSITION IN THE GUIDANCE NOW UNDER DISCUSSION. SINCE IT MIGHT NOT BE THE CASE, THE  
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 04 MBFR V 00014 281758Z

DATA POINT SHOULD NOT BE BUILT INTO THE MAIN BODY OF THE ALLIED POSITION.

D. WE WOULD AGREE WITH MINOR CHANGES PROPOSED BY FRG REP ON PARA. 4D OF REFTEL.

E. WE DISAGREE WITH POSITION TAKEN BY UK REP IN FINAL TWO SENTENCES OF PARA. 5. FOR REASONS GIVEN IN THE ANALYSIS ABOVE, IT IS TO THE WESTERN INTEREST TO TIE A FREEZE AS FIRMLY AS POSSIBLE TO PRIOR AGREEMENT ON REDUCTIONS. ALTHOUGH THIS MAY NOT BE ITS INTENTION, THE UK PROPOSAL MOVES SOMEWHAT IN THE DIRECTION OF WEAKENING A WESTERN PRE-CONDITION THAT THERE BE AGREEMENT ON REDUCTIONS PRIOR TO DISCUSSION OF A FREEZE AND THUS IN THE DIRECTION OF A POSSIBLE SOVIET EFFORT TO SEVER THE LINK BETWEEN THE FREEZE AND REDUCTIONS IN ORDER TO NEGOTIATE ON THE TERMS OF A FREEZE NOW. RESOR

SECRET

NNN

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 01 JAN 1994  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** MILITARY PLANS, MILITARY POLICIES, MUTUAL FORCE REDUCTIONS, FORCE & TROOP LEVELS, NEGOTIATIONS  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 28 JAN 1975  
**Decaption Date:** 01 JAN 1960  
**Decaption Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** GolinoFR  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1975MBFRV00014  
**Document Source:** CORE  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** GS  
**Errors:** N/A  
**Film Number:** D750031-0428  
**From:** MBFR VIENNA  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1975/newtext/t19750115/aaaaamrs.tel  
**Line Count:** 169  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM  
**Office:** ACTION ACDA  
**Original Classification:** SECRET  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 4  
**Previous Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Previous Classification:** SECRET  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** 75 US NATO 0432  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** GolinoFR  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 31 MAR 2003  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** RELEASED <31 MAR 2003 by BoyleJA>; APPROVED <02 APR 2003 by GolinoFR>  
**Review Markings:**

Margaret P. Grafeld  
Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
05 JUL 2006

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** MBFR: NAC DISCUSSION OF EASTERN FREEZE PROPOSAL  
**TAGS:** PARM, NATO  
**To:** STATE DOD  
**Type:** TE  
**Markings:** Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 05 JUL 2006